



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/561,494

05/16/2006

Jeffrey Bruce McGeorge

CULLP0193US

9315

23908 7590 02/17/2010
RENNER OTTO BOISSELLE & SKLAR, LLP
1621 EUCLID AVENUE
NINETEENTH FLOOR
CLEVELAND, OH 44115

EXAMINER

THOMPSON, MICHAEL M

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

3629

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

02/17/2010

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/561,494	Applicant(s) MCGEORGE, JEFFREY BRUCE	
	Examiner Michael M. Thompson	Art Unit 3629	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 04 December 2009.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-8 and 10 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 9 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-8 and 10 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

2. **Claims 1-8 and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Joao (US 2003/0224854).**

3. **With respect to claim 1**, Joao teaches a method of monitoring changes in an information set of wagering information relating to wagers placed on the outcome of a sporting contest, the method comprising the steps of: a. entering into an agreement with a service provider to provide real time monitoring service of changes in an information set of wagering information relating to wagers placed on the outcome of a sporting contest (i.e. explicitly at least via paragraph [0506] and further implicit if not inherent in the function/operation of the prior art); b. receiving wagering information relating to wagers placed by others on the outcome of a sporting contest on a network of computers in real-time (i.e. at least via paragraphs [0008], [0025], [0057], [0077], [0081], [0255], [0425] and passim wherein real-time information is mentioned at least at [0256], passim) ; c. receiving on a network of computers, instructions from a user specifying criteria including at least a sporting contest (i.e. at least via paragraphs [0056] and/or

Art Unit: 3629

[0423] and throughout implying that users set criteria), and a change in the wagering information within a discrete time step prior to the commencement of the sporting contest, the criteria signifying the occurrence of a change in the wagering information significant to the user (i.e. at least via paragraphs [0008], [0257], [0425] for the proposition that the information the user elects to monitor includes changes in the odds prior to commencement of an event); d. comparing the criteria to the wagering information in real-time to determine when a change in the wagering information significant to the user occurs (i.e. again at least via paragraphs [0008], [0025-0026], [0057], [0077], [0081], [0255] [0257], [0425] for the proposition that in determining the alert it is inherent if not implicit that the user criteria is compared to the real-time data); and e. causing a real-time alert message to be issued by an output service associated with the network of computers to a remote communications device (RCD) of the user upon the occurrence of the change in the wagering information within the discrete time step prior to the commencement of the sporting contest as real-time changes in the wagering information occur, the real-time alert message directed to the remote communications device of the user and confirming the occurrence of the change within the discrete time step (i.e. at least via paragraphs [0008], [0080-0082], [0135], [0236], passim).

4. **With respect to claim 2**, Joao teaches all of the limitations of claim 1, including the service provider utilising a “totalisator agency database” to monitor the wagering information (i.e. at least via [0029], [0081], [0259], passim).

5. **With respect to claim 3**, Joao teaches all of the limitations of claim 1, including the remote communications device (RCD) comprises fixed or mobile telephone, a personal computing device or a facsimile or pager of the user (i.e. at least via paragraph [0026], passim).

6. **With respect to claim 4**, Joao teaches all of the limitations of claim 1, including the inherent teaching of a user having an RCD that has a software component (i.e. via at least the communication interface Para. [0285]) which can be used to send an input command to a software environment that is running on the network of computer systems of the service provider (i.e. via at least Para. [0285] when the user/client/principal interacts via the communication device for use with the prior art invention) in response to the input command the software environment sends a local input command to a software environment component that processes the command (i.e. the inherent operation with the wagering application as described in the prior art in any function) and which responds by issuing a local output command to a server infrastructure which in turn sends a remote output command to the RCD (i.e. similarly inherent in computer transmission facilitated in the prior art), and in response to a remote output commands, the RCD issues or displays an alert output (i.e. at least via the usage of the interface for setting criteria and/or alerts wherein the alerts are outputted via the communication device interface for the user to receive).

7. **With respect to claim 5**, Joao teaches all of the limitations of claim 1, including the user can define criteria defining a situation in which alert messages are to be issued

(i.e. again at least via paragraphs [0008], [0025-0026], [0056-0057], [0077], [0080-0082], [135], [236], [0255] [0257], [0423-0425]).

8. **With respect to claim 6**, Joao teaches all of the limitations of claim 1, including the service provider using a network of computers or computer systems to monitor the wagering information (i.e. again at least via paragraph [0046] for the proposition that the functions of this prior art reference, such as monitoring and sending alerts may occur over networks or computer systems).

9. **With respect to claim 7**, Joao teaches all of the limitations of claims 1 and 5, including the network of computers adapted to send and receive information to and from a totalisator agency data server which contains real time information regarding the wagering information. (i.e. rejected under a similar rationale of that of claim 6 for the proposition that an embodiment containing several networks or computer systems will still utilize the “agencies” database in order to access the wager information). Please note that networks are inherently capable or adaptable to allow for sending and receiving information to all types of servers and MPEP 2111.04 for the proposition that claim scope is not limited by claim language that suggests or makes optional but does not require steps to be performed, or by claim language that does not limit a claim to a particular structure.

10. **With respect to claim 8**, Joao teaches all of the limitations of claim 1, further comprising the step of providing at least one history server, to store the wagering information in a database to prevent the need to request the same information numerous times. (i.e. at least via database server supplying information at [0029],

[0079] and/or passim, many of which carry both current and past information of both the wagering information and prior results or outcomes.)

11. **With respect to claim 10**, Joao teaches all of the limitations of claims 1 and 8, including the user communicating to the service provider at least one analysis criteria upon which alert messages are to be sent. (i.e. again at least via paragraphs [0008], [0025-0026], [0056-0057], [0077], [0080-0082], [135], [236], [0255] [0257], [0423-0425]).

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 12-04-2009 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. The Examiner has attempted to clarify the rejection by providing more examples for Applicant in order to expedite prosecution. In particular, Applicant points to the paragraphs cited by the Examiner for the proposition that the prior art fails to teach "a user requesting that a notification be issued dependent upon the movement in the wagering information in a discrete time step prior to the commencement of the sporting contest." Page 5, paragraph 6. Applicant later states that claim 1, "provides the user with an alert containing the notification relevant to the user at the time step determined by the user. The user only has to wait for a single notification rather than many and once the notification is received, can act immediately without filtering the information. It is this decisiveness that allows the user to be ahead of the market reaction and thereby gain advantage. The concept of the discrete time step prior to the start of the contest is not disclosed nor suggested by Joao and therefore, the reference is insufficient to anticipate claim 1. The difference in concept may be subtle but is

Art Unit: 3629

significant.” Page 6, last paragraph. In order to better clarify the Examiner’s rejection and the prior art as applied, the Examiner would like to point out consideration of the full reference reveals additional support for the scope of the Joao patent publication. In the least, Applicant may review paragraphs [0056-0059], [0121 (and respective definitions of counterparty, etc.), [0432], [0642], [0646-0651].

At the heart of Applicants independent claim, Applicant’s claim recites in part, “receiving on a network of computers, instructions from a user specifying criteria including at least a sporting contest, and a change in the wagering information within a discrete time step prior to the commencement of the sporting contest, the criteria signifying the occurrence of a change in the wagering information significant to the user...” It is the Examiner’s position that these limitations are met by the prior art. For example, at least paragraphs [0432 and 0642, [0646-0651] recite instances where the user can set notification for changes in wagering information (i.e. changes in betting and/or odds for a given gambling event.) Given the broadest reasonable interpretation, the “change in wagering information within a discrete time step” may be interpreted in several ways. It may be interpreted as a change in wagering information at some point prior to commencement of the sporting contest. I may similarly be interpreted as a change in wagering at a certain point *in time* such is the case when the user sets a particular wagering parameter to be notified, with respect to changes in wagering information such as betting, odds, or betting by other users. For example, when a user sets a particular parameter with respect to wagering, when these conditions are met prior to commencement the notification will issue. The phrase “within a discrete time

Art Unit: 3629

step prior to commencement of the sporting contest.." modifies the phrase presenting the instructions for trigger, namely, "a change in wagering information..." This signals that the change in wagering is the trigger and it must happen at some point prior to commencement. Therefore, in the least, the prior art explicitly teaches the limitations of Applicant's claims.

With respect to the real-time alert message, Applicant's claims further state "causing a real-time alert message to be issued by an output service associated with the network of computers to a remote communications device (RCD) of the user upon the occurrence of the change in the wagering information within the discrete time step prior to the commencement of the sporting contest as real-time changes in the wagering information occur, the real-time alert message directed to the remote communications device of the user and confirming the occurrence of the change within the discrete time step." It is believed that the clarification as presented above is applicable to the limitations of section "e." of Applicant's claim 1. For example, the betting, odds, and betting user notification as described in Joao teaches notification upon changes in the information. At least for these reasons, this Office Action has been made Final.

Conclusion

12. The Examiner has pointed out particular references contained in the prior art of record, within the body of this action for the convenience of the Applicant. Although the specified citations are representative of the teachings in the art and are applied to the

Art Unit: 3629

specific limitations within the individual claim, other passages and figures may apply.

Applicant, in preparing the response, should consider fully the entire reference as potentially teaching all or part of the claimed invention, as well as the context of the passage as taught by the prior art or disclosed by the Examiner.

13. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Publication number **2008/0274802** and NPL of the website www.youbet.com more than a year earlier of applicants effective filing date reciting a betting website providing several of the services claimed. Please note that several other references originally recited in the PCT search report may also be applicable.

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Michael M. Thompson whose telephone number is (571)

Art Unit: 3629

270-3605. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday thru Friday 8am-5:30 except Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Weiss can be reached on (571) 272-6812. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Michael M Thompson/
Examiner, Art Unit 3629

/JOHN G. WEISS/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3629